

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/998, 919

Applicant(s)

Haillet et al.

Examiner

Sajous Wesner

Art Unit

2618

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sajous Wesner.

(3) Jerome Maillet

(2) James Becker

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5-23-06

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hanrahan


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The inventor and the applicant's representative

discuss the invention and claim in light of the Hanrahan reference and argue that the reference fails to show a discontinuous parameterization texture map. Applicant's rep. proposes to amend the claims to include: "Wherein the parameterization of the object is discontinuous creating texture seams, as discussed in the original specification. The Examiner appears to believe that such proposed amendment may overcome the applied prior art, subject to further review once a formal response is filed.

WS.

5/23/06